REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 9, 2009, and the Advisory Action mailed September 3, 2009

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed June 9, 2009, and the Advisory Action mailed September 3, 2009, Claims 1-40 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Popp, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,291, hereinafter Popp) in view of Schildt (Java 2 The Complete Reference, Fifth Edition, hereinafter Schildt).

II.   Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 27, 29, 31-35, 37 and 40; cancels Claims 14-26; and adds new Claims 41-42, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-13, 27-42.

III.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Popp, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,291, hereinafter Popp) in view of Schildt (Java 2 The Complete Reference, Fifth Edition, hereinafter Schildt).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to further state the feature "*initializing the plurality of controls and allowing each of the plurality of controls to at least one of specify events that it listens for and register events that it can raise;*" and "*associating at least one event handler with at least one control in the plurality of controls to handle an event raised by another control in the plurality of controls using a callback mechanism.*"

Popp discloses an object-oriented approach that provides the ability to develop and manage Internet transaction (Abstract). Furthermore, Popp also discloses that the request and response objects act as a vehicle for passing information between controls (Column 26, Lines 51-60).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the vehicle for passing information between controls in Popp is different from the event handling mechanism, as embodied in Claim 1 as currently amended, which uses a callback mechanism to handle events raised from within a control

- 9 -

tree in response to a request from outside of the control tree.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that Popp and other prior art do not teach or make obvious the above feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 34, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 27 and 40

The comments provided above with regard to Claims 27 and 40 are herein incorporated by reference. Claims 27 and 40 have been amended similarly to Claim 1 to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 27 and 40, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 31

Claims 5 and 31 include a feature of "*wherein the interchangeable lifecycle driver isolates lifecycle driver implementation details from a container of the control tree and allows different lifecycle implementations to be interchanged.*"

Applicant respectfully submits that Popp and other prior arts do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 5 and 31, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 35

Claims 9 and 35 includes a feature of "*at least one of the plurality of controls can advance through the at least one lifecycle stage in parallel with another one of the plurality of controls.*"

Popp discloses the rendering of HTML document without indicating that different controls can advance through lifecycle stage in parallel.

Applicant respectfully submits that Popp and other prior arts do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 9 and 35, as amended, are neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

- 10 -

Claim 41

Newly added Claim 41 depends on Claim 1 and further includes a feature of "*creating one or more new control in the control tree by the event handler to handle a event raised by another control in the control tree that requires rendering of the one or more new control.*"

Applicant respectfully submits that Popp and other prior arts do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 41, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 42

Newly added Claim 42 depends on Claim 1 and further includes a feature of "*the control tree factory is a streaming control tree factory that creates a control tree from an XML Stream.*"

Applicant respectfully submits that Popp and other prior arts do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 42 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-13, 28-30, 32-34, and 36-39

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-13, 28-30, 32-34, and 36-39 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 27 or 40. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-13, 28-30, 32-34, and 36-39 are not addressed in detail herein. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV.   Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

- 11 -

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 9, 2009

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800